

Grouped plan for tooth fungi()

Full report outputted on the 31/07/2003 09:04:29

1. Status of the habitat / species

Please give your most accurate assessment of the status of your species or habitat for the UK and for each country. Leave the row blank where the species or habitat does not occur in that country.

	Amount:	Units:	Year:	Accuracy:	Reference for data:
UK	148	Sites/ Populations	2001	Partial or sample survey	See below
E	92	Sites/ Populations	2001	Partial or sample survey	1) Ewald 2002. Stipitate Hydroid Fungi in the New Forest 1999-2001. Hampshire & IoW Wildlife Trust & English Nature. 2) Green. E. 2001. Survey of Stipitate Hydroid Fungi in Berkshire. English Nature. 3) Marren. P. 2001. Stipitate Hydroid Fungi in England. English Nature Research Report 420.
NI					

S	54	Sites/ Populations	2001	Partial or sample survey	New ton, A., Holden, L., Davy, L. & Watling, R. 2001. Survey of 'Tooth' (stipitate hydroid) fungi in native pinewoods. SNH report.
W	2	Sites/ Populations	2001	Partial or sample survey	Turner. J. 2002. Stipitate Hydroid Fungi in Wales. Plantlife report 208.

Information originally entered by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Monday, October 14, 2002
 Information last changed by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Tuesday, October 29, 2002

2. Trend in Biological Status

Please give your best estimate of the current trend for your species or habitat for the UK, and each appropriate country, using the following categories. Please give an estimate unless there is absolutely no information on which to assess status.

	Trend:	Accuracy:	Reference for data:
UK	Not known	Partial or sample survey	See below

E	Fluctuating / No clear trend	Partial or sample survey	<p>Ew ald, N. 2002. Stipitate Hydroid Fungi in the New Forest 1999-2001. Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust. Marren, P. 2001. Stipitate Hydroid Fungi in England. English Nature Research Report 420.</p>
NI			
S	Not know n	Partial or sample survey	<p>New ton et al 2002. Status and distribution of stipitate hydroid fungi in Scottish coniferous forests. Biological Conservation 107, 181-191.</p>
W	Not know n	Partial or sample survey	<p>Turner, J. 2002. Stipitate Hydroid Fungi in Wales. Plantlife Report No. 208.</p>

Information originally entered by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Monday, October 14, 2002
Information last changed by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Tuesday, December 10, 2002

3. Status of knowledge

To what extent is our scientific knowledge of the habitat / species (e.g research information, autecological knowledge, knowledge for effective re-introduction or habitat restoration/re-creation) sufficient to deliver the plan targets?

Please give an assessment for the UK overall but if there is significant difference in knowledge between different countries this should be noted.

Status of knowledge:	Know ledge sufficient to make some impact, but more research needed. ▼
Notes:	<p>This is a grouped plan for 14 species with different distributions across the UK. Detailed survey effort, particularly in Scotland, the New Forest and Berkshire, has increased the number of sites previously known. However, since fungi fruit sporadically and not necessarily every year, it is not always possible to know whether sites are still extant or whether they have been lost. Whilst evidence from overseas suggests a decline in this group, there is no 'hard' evidence to suggest this is the case in the UK, although they are still a group of conservation concern.</p>

Information originally entered by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Monday, October 14, 2002
Information last changed by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Monday, October 14, 2002

4. Progress on targets

Each of the revised targets from the 2001 Targets Review is listed below.

For each one please give a qualitative assessment of progress for the UK and each country. You can also enter quantitative information on progress by entering data in each of the target boxes and entering the current amount in the amount box. For more information see Help.

T1: Maintain populations at all extant sites.

Target start date: 1998

Target end date: Ongoing

Target units: Sites/ Populations

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Target exceeded (survey success)			Partial or sample survey	Under consideration
E	Target exceeded (survey success)			Partial or sample survey	Under active development
NI					
S	Target exceeded (survey success)		54	Partial or sample survey	Under active development
W	Some progress (on schedule)			Partial or sample survey	Under consideration

T2: Achieve colonisation of two new sites by 2010

Target start date: 1998

Target end date: 2010

Target units: Sites/ Populations

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	Some progress (on schedule)				
E	Some progress (on schedule)				
NI					
S	Some progress (on schedule)				
W					

Information originally entered by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Monday, October 14, 2002
Information last changed by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Tuesday, October 29, 2002

5. Current factors affecting the habitat

When your plan was published the factors (threats) that were thought to be causing loss or decline were listed (in section 2). Re-assessing the current situation may help prioritise actions for your species or habitat. In addition, this enables identification of the main threats to biodiversity across all plans. It is useful to assess whether the importance of different factors is changing and whether there are new issues emerging.

The threat section from the original plan is duplicated below, and a first attempt at categorising the threats has been made. Please confirm that you agree with the categorisation of the original threats identified in the plan (by deleting any wrongly categorised threats and adding the correct category). Please also add to the list any significant threats that have emerged recently, being mindful of environmental issues that have increased in profile or been recognised since plan publication (e.g. climate change). Once you are happy that the list contains all the threats identified in the published plan together with any new ones, please rank them in order of severity (1= highest threat). If the situation has changed and one of the published threats is no longer significant, please leave this in the list but give this rank = 0.

Current factors affecting the habitat from the original publication:

- 2.1 Historic losses of native pine wood and wood pasture, and perhaps also recent losses of these habitats to agriculture and building development is likely to have reduced the UK population of these species.
- 2.2 Changing forest practices such as the introduction of clear-felling and underplanting with conifers may have resulted in the loss of some populations, although there is little evidence to support this. Losses of mature host trees to felling, or a break in the ecological continuity of mature trees on a site, may be a significant threat.
- 2.3 Nutrient enrichment of soils, especially by deposition of atmospheric nitrogen, in which these species occur may be a threat at some sites.
- 2.4 Invasion of Rhododendron is believed to be a threat on at least one site.

Keyworded factors:

To add factors click the add button, to delete factors check the delete box and then click the delete button.

Delete:	Rank:	Keyword:
<input type="checkbox"/>	0	Habitat loss / degradation - agriculture Conversion to arable
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Habitat loss / degradation - infrastructure development Housing infrastructure

- Habitat loss / degradation - woodlands/forestry | Felling / loss of trees (general)
- Habitat loss / degradation - woodlands/forestry | Felling / loss of trees (specific host trees / ancient trees)
- Habitat loss / degradation - woodlands/forestry | Replanting woodland with inappropriate tree species
- Invasive/non-native species (directly affecting species) | Competition
- Pollution - atmospheric | Nitrogen deposition

Information originally entered by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Monday, October 14, 2002
 Information last changed by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Tuesday, December 10, 2002

6. Constraints (optional)

Select the three most significant constraints to achieving the targets of the plan, and indicate the order of priority (1-3 with 1 being the most significant constraint). Only include constraints that are acting as a real blockage to delivering the plan targets or leading to a substantial delay in their delivery. For each constraint, please indicate whether you feel that it is within the ability of the lead partner or steering group to resolve the constraint.

Constraint 1:	
Constraint keyword:	Country:
Research, survey and information Autecology - poor know ledge	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UK <input type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> W

Solution:

More research needed particularly on management requirements, host relationships and fruiting behaviour. A project is currently being developed between Aberdeen University, SNH and Plantlife to tackle some of these research issues

Solution type:

Research

Able to resolve:**Constraint 2:****Constraint keyword:**

Research, survey and information | Genetics/taxonomy - poorly understood

Country:

UK



E



NI



S



W

Solution:

Research into taxonomic relationships between some of the species in the group. A University of London (Birkbeck), RBG Kew, EN project is currently investigating some of these relationships

Solution type:

Research

Able to resolve:**Constraint 3:**

Constraint keyword:	Country:
Research, survey and information Monitoring techniques poorly understood	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UK <input type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> W
Solution:	Solution type:
Development of monitoring methodology	Survey / monitoring
Able to resolve:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Information originally entered by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Monday, October 14, 2002
Information last changed by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Tuesday, October 29, 2002

7. Steering Group

Please list all organisations that are represented on the steering group for your species/habitat (include all organisations that have contributed either directly or by correspondence within the last 3 years). Where a steering group does not exist please leave this form blank.

To add organisations click the add button, to delete organisations check the delete box and then click the delete button.

8. Other Groups/Organisations

Please list any additional groups/organisations that are actively involved in implementing your action plan. (This is to try to assess which groups are involved where there is no steering group and any additional contributors). If you do not have any other organisations involved, click [here](#).

To add organisations click the add button, to delete organisations check the delete box and then click the delete button.

Delete:	Organisation:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Birkbeck College, London
<input type="checkbox"/>	British Mycological Society
<input type="checkbox"/>	Countryside Council for Wales
<input type="checkbox"/>	English Nature
<input type="checkbox"/>	Forestry Commission
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
<input type="checkbox"/>	National Trust for Scotland
<input type="checkbox"/>	Plantlife
<input type="checkbox"/>	Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew
<input type="checkbox"/>	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds

Scottish Natural Heritage

University of Aberdeen

Information originally entered by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Monday, October 14, 2002
Information last changed by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Tuesday, December 10, 2002

9. Linkages to LBAPs

a) Which of the following most accurately describes your interaction with LBAPs, up to now?

Good contact with LBAPs, information exchanged.

b) If you have been in contact with LBAPs how was it initiated?

By LBAP

c) Irrespective of current contact, how important do you consider LBAP co-ordinated action will be in achieving the targets of the plan? Select from category:

Important

d) If you consider LBAP action to be anything other than unimportant, which of the following forms of engagement do you think would be appropriate? (Note, you may tick more than one category.)

Indirect contact (e.g. posting information on UKBAP website, sharing work programmes, meeting schedules, articles in Biodiversity News, newsletter)

- Provision of generic information on habitat and/or species (e.g. advice and guidance on habitat/species ecology and management)
- Direct provision of advice (e.g. proactive approach to LBAP, response to consultations from LBAPs, advice on LBAP target setting)
- Reciprocal attendance at meetings
- Development of collaborative projects

Other (please specify):

Information originally entered by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Monday, October 14, 2002

>

10. Successes (optional)

Have there been key successes in the implementation of your plan that should be drawn to the attention of government, the wider BAP partnership, or the public? Please give a brief description (i.e. 2-3 sentences) of up to three successes and allocate a topic area to each of them:

Success 1:

Description:

Country:

Detailed survey of Scottish pinewoods has increased the number of 10km squares from which these species have been recorded in Scotland to 23.

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Research, survey and information | Baseline survey - achieved or started

Success 2:

Description:

Detailed survey of the New Forest carried out over 3 years coordinated by the Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust with funding from EN and using volunteer surveyors has updated records and identified 19 new sites that have no previous records.

UK E NI S W

Country:

Keyword:

Research, survey and information | Baseline survey - achieved or started

Success 3:

Description:

Country:

The survey of Scottish pine plantations has indicated the status of tooth fungi to be such that there may be little need for artificial establishment of new populations in expanding native pine woods, as suggested by the BAP, since colonisation is occurring naturally

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Species and habitat management | Species range increase - through colonisation

Information originally entered by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Monday, October 14, 2002
Information last changed by Dr Jenny Duckworth on Tuesday, December 10, 2002

Thank you for answering the questions. You have not yet completed all of the questions. You can go back and answer the additional ones or edit the ones you have already answered whenever you want.

Sign-off:

When you have completed all of the questions that you are able to, you must sign off your reporting.

I agree that the steering group (if present) have agreed the information in this report and that the following contact point has also signed it off:

Contact point:	<input type="text"/>	email:	<input type="text"/>
Your name:	<input type="text"/>		
Date:	<input type="text"/>		